

II. REMARKS

A. Summary of Claim Status.

Claims 1 to 64 were presented.

Claims 1 to 38 (Group I claims) were rejected.

Claims 39 to 64 (Group II claims) are withdrawn with traverse.

Claims 1, 7-11, 20, and 26-30 are amended.

Claims 1 to 38 remain pending.

B. Claim Objections for Informalities and Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C §112

Applicant has amended the claims to address the examiner's claim objections to informalities and rejections under 35 U.S.C §112.

C. Obviousness Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiraly et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,249,606, hereinafter, "Kirlay") and Bauersfeld (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,491, hereinafter, "Bauersfeld").

Claims 1 and 20

Claims 1 has been amended to include the following limitation:

wherein the drop down menu program displays menu items in a drop down menu and is modified in accordance with the configuration table to eliminate one or more manual movements required by a user when employing a user input device for activating a button on the drop down menu, selecting a text or menu item on the drop down menu, scrolling through the drop down menu, or sorting items in the drop down menu;

The cited art fails to teach this limitation because the neither Kirlay nor Bauersfeld, individually or in combination disclose modification of a drop down menu by a configuration table “to eliminate one or more manual movements required by a user when employing a user input device.” In addition, neither Kirlay nor Bauersfeld, individually or in combination, disclose “for activating a button on the drop down menu, selecting a text or menu item on the drop down menu, scrolling through the drop down menu, or sorting items in the drop down menu. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification at page 5, lines 1-14, page 16, line 5 to page 17, line 5, and Table I.

Claim 20 has been amended to incorporate a substantially similar limitation which distinguishes over the prior art for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 2-19 and 21-38

Claims 2-19 each depend from and inherit all the limitations of claim 1. Claims 21-38 each depend from and inherit all the limitations of claim 20. As discussed above, claims 1 and 20 contain features and limitations that are not taught by the cited art. Thus, claims 2-19 and 21-38 contain features and limitations that are not taught by the cited art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 20 are in a condition for allowance. The remaining claims depend from either claims 1 or claim 20 and contain all of the elements thereof. Accordingly, claims 1-38 are in a condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would expedite the allowance of this application, the Applicants’ counsel may be contacted at the numbers listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudolf O. Siegesmund

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2800
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-231-4703
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com